



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

APRIL, 1917

## FOR FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

*"God said, I am tired of kings."*

BY THE EDITOR

---

As we write—on the morning of March 19th—it is the common expectation of "high officials" in Washington, of public journals in New York and of folks generally throughout the country, that before another number of this Review appears, the United States of America will be at war with the Kaiser, the Chancellor and the General who now constitute the Government of the German Empire. Needless to remark, not so long ago such a condition of affairs would have been attended by symptoms at least of excitement, such as appeared immediately upon the firing upon Fort Sumter and the blowing up of the *Maine*; whereas now, but for the bustling about of the Secretary of the Navy so faithfully depicted in the public prints, the opening of the baseball season would, as usual at this time of year, hold first place as a prospective happening. Indeed, if such a comparison be permissible, we doubt if Mr. Redfield himself, while serving the Lord as Superintendent of the Central Congregational Sunday-school of Brooklyn, no less dapperly than he now serves the President as Secretary of Commerce, ever stepped down the center aisle to tap the bell more sedately than our traditional Uncle Sam seems likely to saunter into conflict with the most powerful military nation on earth.

Just how it will come about nobody assumes to know; but the stage is being set by the navies of the two nations and the exact date of formal performance has been fixed with painstaking definiteness by the President, without consultation with or much apparent consideration for the wishes of the head of the Hohenzollern clan. Why he selected April 16th as the time for the convening of the new Congress can only be imagined. Many thought he should have named an earlier day, to provide for quick action in case anything should happen, as in fact something did happen when the Germans sank four of our ships. But we surmise that there were good and sufficient reasons for postponement, withheld by prudence from publication. Time was required to assure the freeing of the *Yarrowdale* prisoners; for the safe return of our Ambassador, then held virtually as a hostage; for the upsetting of plans to destroy interned vessels; for the apprehension of known plotters and surveillance of hundreds of suspects; for so placing our battleships and destroyers as to afford the largest measure of protection to our exposed coast cities; for tuning up the batteries within our forts; for fetching into effective co-ordination the many directive forces of the various departments; and finally, as a quite practical matter, for the arming of merchantmen which are to sally forth in search, not of trouble exactly, but of battle, if need shall arise, to maintain American rights. Simultaneously, the German triumvirate sternly declare that their submarine officers have been ordered to shoot up any ship that may appear upon the surface of that portion of the ocean which they have staked off as their own; and there, so to speak, on this peaceful morning of March 19th, we are.

If the circumstances were not surcharged with possible, even probable, consequences of the utmost gravity, we have to confess that the element of opera bouffe would not be wholly lacking. Unless one side or the other is bluffing—and we know that ours is not—Gunner Bill and Lieutenant Fritz are embarking, by specific direction, upon a contest chiefly of wits to see which, without injury to his own craft, can induce the other to perform some act so patently overt as to make his country technically responsible for the war which is regarded as inevitable. It is a situation calling for the exercise of extraordinary ingenuity, owing to the difficulty of doing unto another what he would do unto you,

while permitting him to do it first; but it has been simplified by our own pronouncement that the self-same area is barred to pirates of the sea, thus justifying both Bill and Fritz in shooting on sight, without regard to the customary amenities between Alphonse and Gaston. The President's first idea, we suspect, was to tempt the Kaiser into making an assault which he could present to Congress as a *casus belli*, but now, we are inclined to surmise, he thinks it would look better in history for the war declaration to come from the War Lord—in which case even William Joel Stone would have to vote aye or be discharged. In any case, as we remarked at the outset, it is now fixed as a fact in the public mind that, if Bill sees Fritz or Fritz sees Bill, war between Germany and the United States will follow. It is quite possible, of course, that the anticipated happening will have taken place before these lines fall under the reader's eyes; but we hardly think so; indeed, speaking frankly, we shall not be surprised if the various Fritzes just miss seeing armed American merchantmen for a time, at any rate. But we are running into idle speculation. The point, as we understand it, correctly we hope, is that Germany's only way to keep peace with us is to renounce absolutely assassination from ambush at sea, as long ago she was warned by the President she must do and as she solemnly promised him she would do. Seemingly this cannot now be achieved without so discrediting the Hohenzollern dynasty as to hasten its ultimately certain downfall. Consequently we look—and hope and pray—for War to follow soon the great Message of Patriotism which we have no question the President will deliver to Congress, to America and to all the world on or before the 16th day of April of this glorious year of Democracy Triumphant.

Just as Thomas Jefferson experienced difficulty in compressing a multitude of complaints against a German king of Britain into a modest Declaration of Independence, so will President Wilson, when the time comes, find himself overwhelmed by a sense of the grievances which this country has endured at the will of the madman of Prussia. We shall await with grimmest zest his recital of treaties broken, of wrongs done, of lies told, of treacheries bared, of insults borne, of murders committed, of all the most shameful shocking, mean and low practices against civilization, humanity and common decency recorded even in the history of barbar-

ism, in the face of forbearance for the sake of peace unprecedented in the chronicles of governing Powers. Well and truly might President Wilson say now, as President Madison did say a century and five years ago :

Our moderation and conciliation have had no other effect than to encourage perseverance and to enlarge pretensions. We behold our seafaring citizens still the daily victims of lawless violence, committed on the great common and high way of nations, even within sight of the country which owes them protection. We behold our vessels, freighted with the products of our soil and industry, or returning with the honest proceeds of them, wrested from their lawful destinations. . . . whilst arguments are employed in support of these aggressions which have no foundation but in a principle equally supporting a claim to regulate our external commerce in all cases whatsoever.

“ We behold, in fine,” the President might, as Madison with heed to another Power did, conclude, “ on the side of Germany, a state of war against the United States, and on the side of the United States a state of peace toward Germany.”

Wherefore, in Madison’s time, to even matters, Congress promptly declared war upon the offending nation—a circumstance apparently overlooked by the President when, in his recent message, he remarked by way of contrast that “ we are provincials no longer, the tragical events of the thirty months through which we have just passed have made us citizens of the world.”

The fact is, and it cannot be kept too clearly in mind nor be too strongly emphasized, that we have not been provincials since the Fourth of July, 1776, but ever since that date have been citizens of a world Power. We proclaimed ourselves as such when we declared to the world that these States were free and independent and that as such they had “ full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do ”; and we fulfilled that declaration within the next dozen years and less by levying war, concluding peace, contracting an alliance, establishing an extensive commerce in all parts of the world, and in general comporting ourselves as a fully-fledged nation.

We were not provincials when Decatur was scourging the pirate shore of the Mediterranean with fire and sword, and an American army was invading the inland regions of the

African continent. There was no provincialism in Jefferson when he was suggesting an alliance with England for driving France from the seas and seizing her cis-Atlantic Colonies; when he was advocating an Anglo-American Alliance to counterbalance the Holy Alliance; or when he was broaching the idea "that we consider the whole Gulf Stream as of our waters, in which hostilities and cruising are to be frowned on for the present and prohibited as soon as either consent or force will permit us."

We can perceive few traces of provincialism in American policy when Madison was advocating Anglo-American intervention with force and arms between France and Spain, and between Turkey and Greece; when Adams and Clay and Forsyth were guaranteeing Spain the possession of her American Colonies against all the world, even at peril of war with all the world; when Webster was sending a special agent to investigate and report upon the desirability of intervening between Austria and Hungary; when we were "opening" Japan; when we were participating in an international military expedition for the capture of the Chinese Imperial capital and the rehabilitation of the Chinese Empire; or when we were standing a world Power among the other world Powers in the Congresses at the Hague.

All of these happenings were many years ago, and some of them were much more than a century ago. Surely it is high time for us to realize justly our own status, and to see that in taking part in the affairs of the world we are not entering upon any dubious and perilous "new departure," but are maintaining the sound and consistent policy which was enunciated and practiced by the founders of the Republic and the makers of the Constitution, which has been sustained by every President beginning with Washington and which is bound now to be upheld to the limit of his own courage and his country's resources by Woodrow Wilson.

The issue is in doubt no longer. We know now, if we have not known before, what this war is. It is the last of the great battles for Freedom and Democracy. America fought the first a century and forty years ago. France followed through seas of blood and tears. But lately the Great Charter has passed in its entirety from the barons to the people of England. Japan has ceased to be a monarchy except in name. China as a Republic defies the power of might. Portugal, freed by a bloodless revolution,

stands with the Allies. Personal government has disappeared forever from every part of the Western hemisphere. And now Russia, autocracy of autocracies, casts off the yoke and takes her place in the sun of civilization. Can anyone doubt that the beginning of the end of absolutism is at hand; that the thrones of Hapsburgs and Mahomeds are crumbling; that the whole clan Hohenzollern, no less of Greece and Bulgaria than of Prussia, is doomed beyond recall; that liberty for the patient German people is as certain as freedom for downtrodden Hungary, for despoiled Servia and for bleeding Armenia?

So mighty a change cannot be wrought in a month or likely in a year,—and not at all unless and until the rulers of Central Europe shall yield to a world of freemen. Wholly aside, then, from the injuries and insults which America has endured at the hands of the War Lord and which she is expected to advance as technical grounds for action, does not America's higher duty, her greater opportunity, lie along the path of the shot heard 'round the world? Are we to permit others to finish the glorious work which we began, according to even the infidel Allen, in the name of Almighty God? Shall we renounce our own professed ideals so completely that, at the end of the war, we may not deny as a matter of fitness and right, the transshipment of Liberty Enlightening the World from the harbor of New York to that of Hong Kong or Vladivostock? Must even China be allowed to forge ahead of America in defense of democracy?

We are for war; of course, we are; and for reasons good and plenty, to wit:

(1) Because we have reached and passed the limit of forbearance in trying to maintain amicable relations with a barbaric brute who has presumed so far upon our good intent as to treat our most conciliatory and helpful suggestions with glaring contempt, who has incited all manner of treasonable activities and damnable outrages within our borders, has gloated over his avowed assassination of our innocent and harmless citizens of both sexes and all ages upon the high seas and has missed no opportunity to deceive, to sneer at and to lie to our constituted authorities; because to conserve our own self-respect we are driven finally to the point where we must fight or forfeit the decent opinion of all mankind; because we cannot even seem to condone the breaking of treaties, the burning of villages to no

purpose except to deprive the poor and helpless of shelter essential to mere existence, the enslavement of men who alone could save their families from destitution and death from starvation, the violating of women and young girls, the bayonetting of little children, the approved indiscriminate slaughter by the unspeakable Turks of thousands of helpless Christians in Armenia, and God only knows what else and what more that has stamped the Hun for more than one generation to come as the sublimated hero of the shambles of humanity; because, in a word, we cannot acknowledge the supremacy of might and frightfulness over right and righteousness without denying our faith in the living God;—

(2) Because we owe it to our forefathers who founded the Republic and to our fathers who saved the Union to prove ourselves not merely worthy of the happiness which flows from prosperity but eager and fearless in support of free life and full liberty the world over, to the end that the noble example set by them may not be degraded in gluttonous realization by us; because as a practical matter if spies and traitors infest our land now is the time to smoke them out; if a few scattering undersea waifs can break down our defenses and damage our cities, let them do their utmost, that we may discover what might be anticipated from a fleet and prepare accordingly; if our navy is lopsided and deficient, our provision for a defensive army unfulfilled and unrealizable, our stores of ammunition insufficient, our air-machines and submarines but samples, to-day when only negligible harm can come to us is the day to acquaint ourselves with the facts; and if, as we are told, so many of us are pro-this or pro-that and so many more are putting pelf above patriotism and so many more should be feeding off our own fat instead of mulcting lean Chautauquans, then what we need is a test—a test of body, of mind and of spirit,—a trying-out by fire while yet there is time to make America fit for any real emergency; yes, and able, through universal training, to obviate the necessity of universal service; because simply and finally, in such a case, war is curative, not destructive; a blessing, not a curse.

(3) Because our going into the great conflict at this psychological moment would not only complete the ring of democracies around the doomed autocracy and so render the ultimate result certain to the dullest and the blindest, but also from that very fact would infect all Germany, all



Austria and all Hungary with the new spirit of Russia, and so by surely shortening and perhaps quickly ending the war, would save millions of precious lives, certain else to be sacrificed to no purpose other than impoverishment of the human race for centuries to come.

Whether the condoning by the President of so many offenses during the past two years has yielded actual gain to humanity need not now be considered. That he was enabled to say simply, in words which none could dispute, that he "need give no further proofs and assurances" that he had been indeed "the friend of peace" and still meant "to preserve it for America so long as able," surely constituted no mean background for the prompt and resolute action which so completely surprised Germany when tame submission was fully anticipated.

So much at least is clear. And when to the regretful assertion that he "could do no less" was added the solemn declaration that "there can be no turning back," the President had full warrant, regardless of past differences of opinion, to beg from his countrymen that "tolerance, countenance and united aid" which has been accorded in fullest measure. If at any time, while hearkening to the timorous voices of Representatives whose fair constituents did not raise their boys to be soldiers or, speaking more precisely and less agreeably, to fight for their country, Mr. Wilson may have doubted the answer to a patriotic appeal, surely all misgivings must now have disappeared before a response unprecedented in unanimity and resolution. In times of stress and danger the American people require from their Chief Magistrate neither inconclusive interpretation nor indeterminate consultation. All they ask is masterful leadership based upon mutual faith of the President in his country and of the country in its President.

*As an American, faithful to American ideals of justice, liberty and humanity, and confident that the Government has exerted its most earnest efforts to keep us at peace with the world, I hereby declare my absolute and unconditional loyalty to the Government of the United States, and pledge my support to you in protecting American rights against unlawful violence upon land and sea, in guarding the nation against hostile attacks, and in upholding international right.*

*"And for the support of this Declaration, [wrote Thomas Jefferson] with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine*

*Providence, We mutually pledge to each other [and to you our President] our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.'"*

## THE SPECIAL SESSION

IN calling a special session of Congress, to meet this month, the President has done a wholly commendable and by no means unusual act. In a sense he is repeating himself. He began his first Administration with a special session, called a little earlier in April than this one; and he is beginning his second Administration in the same way. That former Congress was notable for having the longest special session and the longest aggregate of sessions on record in our history; and while the present Congress cannot quite equal it, there is a probability that it will pretty closely approximate it.

Special sessions are not, we have said, unusual. There have been thirty-seven of them in our history before the present. Of these, however, practically one-third have been called to meet in November, only a few weeks or even days before the regular sessions, with which they were continuous. Only one, the second session of the first Congress, was called to meet in January; six have been summoned in March; three in April, which, strangely enough, were the first of all and the last two before the present; four in May, two in July, two in August, two in September, four in October, and thirteen in November. It will be interesting, and perhaps suggestive of instruction, briefly to review the causes and circumstances of these special sessions.

The first two, of our first Congress, may be passed lightly. It was necessary that Congress should be called together in April, 1789, in order to organize the Government, and seeing that the session did not adjourn until the end of September, and seeing, too, the slow means of travel of those times, it was not strange that it did not reassemble until January 4 following, the only January meeting on record. This latter was, by the way, really a delayed regular rather than a special session; though since it met at an irregular time it is commonly regarded as the latter. Both regular sessions of the second Congress were preceded by special sessions, called the first in October and the second in November, the

special and regular sessions being continuous. The second regular session of the third Congress was similarly preceded by a special session, called in November.

The Fifth Congress was in troublous times, perhaps more like the present than any other in our history. We were at the beginning of our undeclared war with France, and were confronted with sedition and lawless plots within as well as unfriendly aggressions without. It was at the beginning of John Adams's Administration; there was urgent need of military preparation and increased revenue, beside the moral support which Congress could give to the President; and so on March 25, three weeks after his inauguration, Adams called Congress to meet on May 15. The result of a fifty-seven days' session was the enactment of laws empowering the President to use the navy for the protection of American rights, and to enlist 80,000 troops for three months, providing heavy punishment for privateering against a friendly nation, and imposing additional tariff duties. The subsequent regular session of that Congress was preceded by a special session in November, making a sitting which lasted two hundred and forty-six days, and was the longest on record down to 1841.

The second session of the Sixth Congress met on November 17, 1800, and was the first to meet in Washington. The eighth Congress met specially in October, 1803, to complete the Louisiana Purchase, and again in November, 1804. The tenth Congress had a similar record, meeting in October, 1807, to consider the crisis caused by the British Orders in Council and the proposed embargo; and again in November, 1808. The same crisis caused the convening of the eleventh Congress in May, 1809, at the beginning of Madison's Administration. It adjourned in June, but met again in November, and continued with the subsequent regular session in December.

The Twelfth Congress, epochal in its action, met in advance of the regular date, on November 4, 1811. Clay and Calhoun made their first appearances in the House of Representatives, and infused their "young blood" into the leadership of that body. The session continued with the regular one in December, and did not end until July 6, 1812; Congress meantime admitting Louisiana to the Union, increasing the army, doubling the tariff, and declaring war against Great Britain. In two hundred and forty-five days

that Congress passed one hundred and thirty acts, and heard the doctrine of secession first proclaimed within its halls—by Josiah Quincy of Massachusetts! Because of the exigencies of the war the next session met in November, 1812.

The same causes moved Madison to begin his second Administration with a special session, which met on May 24, 1813, with Henry Clay as Speaker of the House, and with Daniel Webster a member for the first time. The last act of that session, on the day of adjournment, was to levy a direct tax of \$3,000,000. The third session of that Congress met in September, 1814, a week after Key had written "The Star Spangled Banner," Washington, meantime, having been captured by the invading British, and the Capitol having been burned. The second session of the Fifteenth Congress met in November, 1818, and before it adjourned that body had the Florida question and the Missouri Compromise question on its hands. The second session of the Sixteenth Congress met in November, 1820, and before final adjournment Missouri was admitted, the Compromise was adopted, and the sectional issue between South and North was fully defined.

There were no more special sessions thereafter until the Twenty-fifth Congress, in 1837, when President Van Buren convened it in his first year, in September. The Senate passed the Sub-Treasury bill which he desired, but the House rejected it, and he was glad to see it adjourn after only 43 days. President Harrison, on taking office in 1841, called a special session for May 31, but died long before it met. Tyler wrestled with it, vetoing some of its chief measures, until it adjourned on September 13, and that was the last of special sessions for fifteen years. All the Texas annexation and Mexican war business did not necessitate a special session. But in August, 1856, the civil war in Kansas moved President Pierce to call Congress together to pass an army appropriation bill. The former session had adjourned on August 18, after refusing to pass the army appropriation bill because of a proviso that the army should not be used to aid the pro-slavery faction in Kansas. The special session met three days later, passed the bill without the proviso, and adjourned on August 30, after sitting only ten days, the shortest session on record.

There were no more special sessions until the Thirty-seventh Congress, which, despite all that happened in the

first three months of his Administration, Lincoln did not call together until the Fourth of July, 1861. Meantime, without Congressional action, the President had called out 75,000 troops, added 22,714 men to the regular army and 18,000 to the navy, proclaimed a blockade of the ports of the seceding States, and proclaimed martial law and suspended the writ of habeas corpus in certain districts. He seemed to have no doubt of his powers to preserve the integrity of the Union. Nor did he ask a long session of Congress. On the contrary, its 34 days constituted the second shortest on record. It met on July 4, authorized a loan of \$250,000,000 and the enlistment of 500,000 men, and adjourned on August 6, leaving the President to carry on the war on his own responsibility. Nor did Lincoln feel the need of any more special sessions while he was President.

After him, the deluge. Extraordinary as it seems, the assassination of Lincoln and the accession of Johnson to the Presidency called for no special session. But when the conflict between the President and the radical faction in Congress reached its height, things happened. The Fortieth Congress met for the first time on March 4, 1867, for twenty-six days; on July 3 for eighteen days; and on November 21 for twelve days; distrusting the President and deeming it advisable "that the President should not be allowed to have control of events for eight months without the supervision of the legislative branch of the Government." The regular session met at the constitutional date in December, 1867, and sat until July 27, when it adjourned to September 21; then met for one day and adjourned to October 16; then again met for one day and adjourned to November 10; when it met and at once adjourned until the constitutional date in December.

The Forty-first Congress, at the beginning of Grant's administration, met on March 4, 1869, and sat for only thirty-eight days. The Forty-second Congress did likewise, meeting on March 4, 1871, for forty-seven days. The Forty-fifth met in extra session on October 15, 1877, and continued until the regular session began on December 3, the principal business being the introduction of the famous Bland free silver bill which, passed over the President's veto in the subsequent regular session, produced the Bland or "buzzard" dollar. Another March session came in 1879, of the Forty-sixth Congress, when for the first time since Buchanan's first Congress, both branches were Democratic.

Fourteen years then passed without a special session, but on August 7, 1893, President Cleveland called the Fifty-third Congress together to deal with the "currency famine" and general financial crisis. The chief business was the repeal of the silver purchase law, and while this was effected by the House on August 28, it was not done by the Senate until October 30 because of lack of power to stop dilatory speech-making. In the course of that fight the Senate was once in continuous session for thirty-eight and three-quarter hours, and Senator Allen held the floor with a single "speech" for fourteen hours. But even that disgusting spectacle did not move the "deliberative body" to adopt rational rules.

The next special session was called in March, 1897, chiefly to revise the tariff under the McKinley Administration, and it lasted one hundred and twenty-one days. The regular session of December, 1897, was still in existence when the crisis with Spain came on, and so no special session was necessary for that war. In 1903 the Fifty-eighth Congress came together on November 9, as a prelude to the regular session in December. In 1909 another March session was called, chiefly for tariff revision, which was effected after one hundred and forty-four days.

In 1911 came the first April session since Washington's first Congress. It was the first meeting of a Democratic House of Representatives for sixteen years, and it was the first time in history that a Republican President had called a Democratic House together to pass a measure which a Republican Senate had rejected, or had refused to consider. It was a proceeding which assured the division and defeat of the Republican party which occurred two years later. Again, in April, 1913, President Wilson called the sixty-third Congress together in special session, for tariff revision, this being the third time in a dozen years that such a session had been called for that specific purpose. That session, beginning on April 7, became continuous with the regular session in December, and together they made the longest on record, three hundred and twenty-eight days.

The special session which is now about to assemble may well prove to be as memorable as any that has gone before it. It will resemble, *mutatis mutandis*, that of 1911, in that a Democratic President is calling together a Congress with what may prove to be a Republican House to do the work which a Democratic Senate refused to do. It will certainly

be notable as the first session for nearly a century in which the Senate will not be subjected to danger of such scandalous exhibitions as that of 1893. We may indeed hope that both Houses will meet in a chastened and refined spirit, intent upon rendering loyal service to the nation and thus "doing their bit" toward redeeming parliamentary government from the discredit into which it has undoubtedly fallen throughout the world during the last two or three years.

This latter circumstance is indeed one of the most noteworthy connected with the era of the world war. In the Central Empires, of course, parliaments have little to do in such an emergency. They are fulfilling the words of Bismarck fifty-five years ago, that the problems of the day are to be settled not by speeches and parliamentary decrees, but by blood and iron. But in the comparatively liberal and parliamentary countries the case is little better. The British Parliament has done little that it should have done, and much that it should not have done, and real conduct of affairs has been left to administrative officers. The French Parliament has been still less efficient. Nobody has thought of what it is doing. The real rule has been exercised by the commanding general of the army. In Italy the Parliament has not distinguished itself.

In the United States neither House of Congress nor Congress as a whole has been distinguished for any large or masterful grasp of one of the most important and critical situations in all our history. Senators and Representatives have showed themselves largely moved by faction rather than by patriotism. Sometimes they have supinely obeyed Presidential dictation; other times they have stubbornly resisted the will of the President, even when it was most clear that his will was identical with that of the nation. Through it all they have displayed an insatiable appetite for appropriational "pork." It has been a sorry spectacle.

This criticism does not, of course, apply to all. There are men in each House to-day as pure and unselfish and ardent in patriotism as any who have ever sat there, and comparable with any in competence to legislate for the nation. What is needed is that they shall assert their natural leadership, and that their spirit shall prevail. We were arguing a little while ago that the breaking down of international law in this war was no reason for abandoning it, but rather was the best of reasons for rehabilitating it and mak-

ing it stronger than ever before. The same is to be said of parliamentary institutions. If for the time they seem almost to have failed, so much the more cause for strengthening them and making them triumphant. The Senate is taking a long step in that direction in making itself able to legislate while not abandoning the privilege and duty of deliberation. It lies within its power and that of the House to make this special session epochal for its vindication of the Congressional system. It will be cause for profound regret and everlasting reproach if that power is not efficiently exercised.

### WHEN PEACE COMES, WHAT?

PEACE will come. That is inevitable. We offer no apologies for repeating that reminder from recent issues of this REVIEW, or for recurring to the subject which we have discussed at length. It is really a much more important subject than that of the war, which people seem never to grow weary of discussing, and it is gratifying to observe the increasing attention which is being paid to it in the press and elsewhere. It has been eminently desirable to ask what we should do in case we became involved in the war, because it was desirable for us to have the most complete possible preparation for any belligerent contingencies, whether they ever were realised or not. But it is no less desirable for us to consider what we are to do when we become involved in restored peace, which we are absolutely certain to do; and it is well to be reminded, as Mr. James Keeley in a spirited series of articles on the subject in the *Chicago Herald* does remind us, that in England the policy of "Wait and See" is denounced as one of madness and suicide.

We take it for granted that we are not to engage in a trade war such as some in Europe are suggesting, and such as it is quite possible some European Powers will wage against each other. That is not American policy, and we do not think that it will ever be. Jefferson's ideal, which has long been the ideal of the nation, was "Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all." That in spirit forbids trade wars, which are just as repugnant to commerce as military wars are to political peace. We mean, of course, trade wars which are wantonly or aggressively waged, for the sake of achieving commercial conquests by means of injuring or



destroying the trade of other nations. There can be no rational objection to a defensive trade war, if it is forced upon us for our own protection, any more than to a defensive military war against armed attack. Therefore there can be no objection to what we may call commercial preparedness, any more than to military preparedness. On the contrary, there is the strongest possible demand for it, logically, and for such preparedness—again like military preparedness—for both or either commercial peace or commercial war. It is hoped that commercial peace and nothing more than friendly competition will prevail, unbroken, and our commercial preparedness is to be adapted not only to development and maintenance under such circumstances but also to the promotion of them; precisely as a rational military preparedness will make us a more efficient people in our prosecution of the arts and activities of peace. But in case that peace is unfortunately broken, and commercial hostilities are directed against us, we are to be enabled to meet the crisis promptly and effectively, under the “immutable law of self-defense,” just as we should repel an attack by hostile armies and navies.

Let us carry the apt parallel further, and observe what other nations are doing by way of preparation for renewed commercial activities at the return of peace. Great Britain has recently made what is tantamount to universal conscription of the people, women as well as men, for national service; not alone for directly prosecuting the war but also for maintaining and increasing an industrial and commercial efficiency which will be of the greatest possible significance upon the renewal of normal relations with the world. Despite the vastly increased production of military munitions, and the use of many mercantile manufacturing plants for that purpose, there has been scarcely any decrease of the industrial efficiency of the nation, and the readiness with which the munitions factories can be transformed and devoted to peaceful purposes will make that country, immediately after the conclusion of peace, much more capable than it was before the war in manufactures and trade. Shipbuilding for mercantile purposes has been followed during the war to such a degree that the total tonnage has been reduced little if any by the destruction inflicted by the German U-boats; and with all the demand for military munitions, a great British firm was able to underbid all American firms with an offer to supply this country with

shells. Concerning Germany we know less, but there are authentic reports that her industries, in factories and ship-yards, have been maintained during the war in high efficiency and with an extraordinary rate of productiveness. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that if the war were to end today, tomorrow would see the ocean thronged with British and German merchant vessels seeking all the markets of the world with cargoes of merchandise.

Preparation to meet this competition must be a complex operation, but it must be effected upon the basis of certain general principles, and conspicuous and essential among these must be reckoned that of domestic reciprocity and co-operation between Government policy and private initiative and endeavor. That has been one of the prime factors in Germany's unexampled progress in industry and commerce, and it is the factor which Great Britain is now most tactfully and most efficiently employing. That does not mean, or at any rate it should not mean in America, government ownership of industries, nor corporate ownership of the government; either of which extremes would be a calamity, defeating the aims and objects of democracy. But neither of them is necessary to the most complete measure of the co-operation to which we have referred.

There can scarcely be a greater delusion than that government ownership and operation of industries and utilities is the only alternative to monopolies and offensive trusts. It is as unreasonable and as unfounded as to say that anarchy is the only alternative to despotism. The essential spirit of democracy requires for the individual a free initiative in industry just as much as in politics. The citizen must be as free to work or to trade as he is to vote. Moreover, there must be similar freedom of combination; and as citizens are free to combine themselves into political parties, in order to exert an influence and to accomplish ends which would be beyond their reach if acting individually, so they must be free to combine in business corporations, in order to effect results which would be impossible to individuals. That is democracy.

That does not, however, deny governmental control and regulation of corporations, as of individuals. The Government determines who may become citizens of the commonwealth, and it makes laws for the control of those citizens. So it determines under what conditions corporations may be

created and it charters them; and it can appropriately regulate and control those corporations in their activities. That is constitutional and logical. Nor is the National Government deprived of the power to control corporations even though it does not itself charter them. If the State charters them, it has the natural right to control its own creatures. But the vast majority of important corporations do business in more than one State, and are, therefore, under a familiar clause of the Constitution, subjected to national control.

In such control, and in all the attitude and acts of the National Government toward corporations and toward industry in general, we do not believe in oppression, and neither do we believe in fostering monopolies nor in connivance at the enjoyment of special privilege. There is a vast difference between control and oppression, and there is no less difference between fostering a monopoly and promoting an industry. Or perhaps we should say, promoting industry, in general. It cannot for a moment be maintained that this latter is not a legitimate purpose of governmental action, whether of legislation or administration. It is prescribed in the Constitution itself. One of the objects of that instrument is "to promote the general welfare," just as much as to form a more perfect union or to provide for the general defence. Nor is the welfare restricted or qualified. It is not merely the political, or the educational, or the moral welfare that is to be promoted, but the general welfare, including industrial, commercial, economic.

Now that does not mean either a high protective tariff or absolute free trade; neither of which, indeed, would serve the purpose. It must now be recognized that the benevolent and enchanting idealism of Cobden was little more than an iridescent dream. He told his followers that they must not doubt that in fifty years the whole world would be converted to absolute free trade and would be practising it, any more than they must doubt that the sun would rise next morning. But many more than fifty years are now past, and the world is further from such a condition of affairs than it was in Cobden's own day. He prophesied, too, that universal free trade would mean universal disarmament and universal pacifism; from which the world is certainly far removed to-day, in spite of Mr. Bryan, the Cobden of our time—or was Cobden, the Bryan of his time?

On the other hand it is certainly to be recognized, as Mc-

Kinley, the great protagonist of protection, recognized, that unnecessary tariffs are evil, and that any protective system which favors special interests, to the harm of others, is a detestable thing. It is not the welfare of this or that industry, or this or that class, that is to be promoted, but the "general" welfare, the welfare of all industries and of all classes. That does not mean that all industries are to be equally protected or fostered by legislation or other governmental action, because their needs are by no means equal. Some have been able to prosper from the beginning without any protection, while others could probably never have come into existence without it. Because one does not need aid is no reason why another which does need it should not have it; and because one which needs it gets it is no reason why another which does not need it should get it. In brief, the tariff question is not a political game of "You tickle me and I'll tickle you," as it has too often been; nor is it, as also it has too often been, a system of fostering special industries for their own exclusive and perhaps excessive profits. It is a scientific question of the promotion of the general welfare, as provided by the Constitution.

We have learned much since the time when Jefferson wanted us to have no ocean commerce, no manufactures and no large cities. We have come to realize, and we have realized it with especial keenness during the present war, that that nation is strongest and most prosperous which is in material affairs most nearly sufficient unto itself; that is, which has the greatest variety of resources, products and manufactures, and which is thus most perfectly able to supply its own needs. In performing its constitutional function of promoting the general welfare it is not only permissible for the Government but is incumbent upon it to have regard for the development of such a state of affairs. As the various industries owe to the Government their loyalty, their support and their sincere compliance with the laws, so reciprocally the Government owes to them such benevolent regard as will, without catering to special privileges, promote the general welfare of all.

There has been a curious touch of irony in our Government's attitude toward industry and commerce. It has been our pride that we are pre-eminently an industrial nation. At first chiefly agricultural, we have developed also into manufacturing and commercial greatness. This characteristic we

have vaunted above the militarism which we have affected to regard as a reproach to other nations. We were peaceful and industrious; they were warlike. Yet from the very first our Government has paid far more attention to military than to industrial affairs. We began our Constitutional Government with a Secretary of War, in 1789, and in precedence he was the third of the Cabinet officers. It was not until a full century later, in 1889, that we considered government interest in agriculture, always our greatest industry, to be sufficient to warrant the appointment of a Secretary of Agriculture; and he was, of course, placed at the very foot of the list. In 1798 we created a Navy Department, with a Secretary in the Cabinet; and not until a hundred and five years afterward did we reckon our peaceful commerce to be of sufficient interest to call for the appointment of a minister to look after its interests, then grouping commerce and labor together under a single Secretary. Finally, in 1913, nearly a century and a quarter after the organization of the Government, we reluctantly concluded that it would be worth while to give to Commerce and Labor each a Secretary.

Compare, or contrast, this indifference to industrialism with the policy of European states. Austria, under the reactionary autocracy of the Hapsburgs, has long had four industrial Ministers—of Commerce, of Railways, of Agriculture and of Labor. Belgium has had four, of Agriculture,—often held by the Prime Minister himself,—of Industry, of Railways, and of Public Works. France has four, of Commerce and Industry, of Agriculture, of Labor and of Public Works. Germany remits such matters largely to the individual states, but there are imperial bureaus or boards of Railways, of Tariff, and of Trade and Commerce. Prussia has ministers of Agriculture and Forests, of Commerce and Industry, and of Public Works. The same is true of other European countries, and also of the countries of Latin America. They have all been paying more official attention to industrial affairs, and have done more “to promote the general welfare” than we.

It is time for America to awake to the importance of fulfilling more perfectly that provision of the constitution. The principle of *laissez faire* will no longer serve our purpose in the increasingly intense competition among nations. We are all, despite Mr. Bryan, coming to realize the necessity of being well prepared for war before war comes upon us,

so as to meet its initial onset with complete readiness. So we should recognize the necessity of being fully prepared for peace before it comes back to the world, so that the moment it comes we shall be ready for its problems and its opportunities.

We are now pretty generally convinced that universal service is the only rational and effective method of securing military preparedness, at any rate in harmony with democratic principles. We ought equally to realize the necessity of universal co-ordination of industries and complete co-operation between the Government and private enterprise, as the only rational and effective method of securing the industrial and commercial efficiency which will enable us successfully to defend ourselves and to improve our opportunities in the era of restored peace which will presently come to the world.